DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 638 **CE 022 258**

TITLE	A Followup Study of the CETA College Adapter Program. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of Occupational Education Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/CE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 78
NOTE	39p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Achievement; *Admission (School); College Admission; Followup Studies; *Postsecondary Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; School Holding Power; *Student Characteristics; *Student Evaluation; Success Factors
IDENTIFIERS	College Adapter Program; *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine whether Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) project completers in the college adapter program (CAP) have shown evidence of successful performance in a postsecondary program. Specific objectives of the project were (1) to determine the number of CETA project completers who matriculated at college, (2) to determine the extent of continuation at college by CETA project completers, (3) to determine the number of former CAP clients who completed a college program, and (4) to detect any client variables which may be related to college continuation or completion rates. Among the findings were that the majority of clients have attained the educational qualifications prerequisite to college admission and that there is a 75% retention rate for clients who actually matriculated. Other firdings indicate differences between the characteristics of clients admitted to different courses of study and clients admitted to different colleges. (Included in the appendixes are CAP CETA program descriptions, college admissions and characteristics of CETA clients in the CAP, and CAP characteristics by courses of study.) (LRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BOER-78-1

AUG 17 RECD

ED173638

A FOLLOWUP STUDY OF THE CETA COLLEGE ADAPTER PROGRAM

Final Report

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Occupational Education Research
Albany, New York 12234
October 1978

CE022368

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FORWARD

The purpose of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973 is to provide employment and training programs for unemployed and underemployed youth and adults. Operating within a decentralized system, state and local prime sponsors design and implement programs to meet the needs of local labor markets and those of potential workers.

As labor markets differ so do programs designed to help people become employed. The College Adapter Program examined in this study is one approach to linking people and jobs.

The study was carried out by the Bureau of Occupational Education Research, The State Education Department under the supervision of Alan G. Robertson, Chief. Questions and comments should be directed to Dorothy H. King, telephone 518: 474-6386.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	3
	Data Tabulation	3
	Sample Selection	4
	Followup and Validation	6
	Data Analysis	6
III.	RESEARCH FINDINGS	6
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
	Conclusions	18
	Recommendations	20
APPENDIX		21

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES		PAGE
I.	CAP Enrollments, Terminations and College Admissions by Division and Project Number	4
II.	Clients in Sample by Project Number	5
III.	Cohort Retention Rates[1] New York State Four-Year Institutions and Programs	15
IV.	Cohort Retention Rates[1] New York State Two-Year Institutions and Programs	16
V.	Cohort Retention Rates[1] The City University of New York Community Colleges	17
VI.	High School Class of 1972 Percentage Entering College	17
VII.	High School Class of 1972 Percentage of Those Enrolled in College Who Withdrew by Fall 1973	18
VIII.	Contingency Data by Socioeconomic Status (SES), Sex, and Race (2-Year College)	19

A FOLLOWUP STUDY OF THE CETA COLLEGE ADAPTER PROGRAM

FINAL REPORT

I. Introduction

The College Adapter Program, conducted in New York City by the Higher Education Development Fund, provides post-secondary education preparation to disadvantaged youth and adults. Although the program has operated for several years, support under the Federal Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) was first provided in April 1975. The first group of program completers entered college in January 1976.

The primary objective of the program is to assist clients in attaining the educational qualifications which are prerequisites for admission to post-secondary institutions. The program provides educational counseling, financial aid and career counseling, educational testing, high school equivalency examination preparation (GED), computational and communication skill building, and related services. Brief descriptions of the several CETA projects which have provided financial support for this program are presented in Appendix A.

Formal admission to a post-secondary institution is equated with completion of the College Adapter Program. Information on the admission of CETA clients to post-secondary education is available in project files maintained by the Bureau of Special Occupational Education Services. However, little information is available on the post admission performance of those completers.

Statement of the Problem. The problem addressed in this study is that of determining whether CETA project completers have shown evidence of

successful performance in a post-secondary program. For the purposes of this report, successful performance in a post-secondary program was defined as matriculation at a college and either continuation of enrollment in college at the time of the study or completion of the college program. Matriculation was defined as enrollment in the college to which the client was admitted as admission was shown in CAP records.

Purposes of the Study. The purposes of the study were:

1. to determine the number of CETA project completers who matriculated at college;
2. to determine the extent of continuation at college by CETA project completers;
3. to determine the number of former CAP clients who completed a college program; and
4. to detect any client variables which may be related to college continuation or completion rates.

The study was conducted by the Bureau of Occupational Education Research, The State Education Department, at the request of the Bureau of Special Occupational Education Services.

The final report of the study was submitted to the Bureau of Special Occupational Education Services with copies to all cooperating offices. Confidentiality of information was maintained, and no individual CETA client or post-secondary institution was identified in the study report.

Limitations of the Study. As originally planned, no attempt was made in the study to compare the success rate of College Adapter Program completers with other groups of CETA clients or with any other college population. However, the final report, in draft form, was submitted to a number of agencies and individuals concerned with problems addressed

in the study. One reviewer presented a comparison between CAP retention rates and those of similar programs. This comparison has been included in the section on research findings.

No attempt was made to followup either additional CAP completers who became employed rather than entering college or non-completers. The study was designed for SED internal use and was not distributed to the general public.

II. Research Methodology

In so far as possible, information for the study was extracted from existing records. Sources searched for data relevant to the study are listed in Appendix B. Data on college matriculation, continuation, and completion were obtained through use of a mail questionnaire distributed to all units of the City University of New York (CUNY) system to which CAP clients had been admitted.

The Higher Education Development Fund provided the names of 1,023 former CETA clients who had been accepted for admission to a post-secondary institution. Table I shows the numbers of clients enrolled in the program, terminated as of January 1, 1978 and admitted to college, by division and by project number.

Client characteristics and/or college admissions data were incomplete for three of the original group of clients; these students were eliminated from further study leaving a total of 1020 former clients.

Data Tabulation. Client admissions data and client personal characteristics data were tabulated by program division (day/evening), by course of study, and by college to which clients were admitted.

TABLE I
CAP ENROLLMENTS, TERMINATIONS AND COLLEGE ADMISSIONS
BY DIVISION AND PROJECT NUMBER

Project No.	Total Enrollments	Positive* Terminations	Admissions/Division Day	Evening
75SG42	175	137		114
76SG36	207	164		160
76SG66	579	406	369	
77SG12 (78SG11)	260	208		178
77SG48 (78SG6)	517	258	202	
Totals	1738	1173	571	452

*Positive terminations include persons becoming employed.

Due to small numbers of clients admitted to some courses of study and to some colleges, grouping of data was necessary. The courses of study grouping was based on commonalities of occupational skills needed for satisfactory performance on the job, while the grouping of colleges was based on number of persons admitted to the college (less than 10). Course groupings are listed in Appendix C, while data on client characteristics and courses of study are presented in Appendix D.

Sample Selection. To assess the matriculation, continuation and completion performance of former CAP clients, sampling methods developed by The National Education Association Research Division were applied.[1/]

[1/] Sample-Techniques. Research Bulletin. Research Division of the National Education Association. Washington. Vol. 38, No. 4. December 1960. Pp. 99-104.

Using the formula:

$$n = [x^2Np(1-p)] \div [d^2(N-1) + x^2p(1-p)]$$

where n = the required sample size

x^2 = the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom and desired confidence level

N = the population size (1,020 clients)

p = the population proportion which it is desired to estimate (assumed to be .50 since this would provide the maximum sample size)

d = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (.05),

a sample of 280 clients was determined to be sufficient to draw conclusions on differences among and between groups. An upward adjustment in sample size was made to take into account previous experience with CETA data quality, resulting in a final sample of 350 former clients. After each client had been assigned a number, corresponding numbers for the sample were selected from a table of random digits developed by the Rand Corporation and recommended for use in Community Manpower Surveys.[2/] A breakout of clients in the total sample is shown in Table II.

TABLE II
CLIENTS IN SAMPLE
BY PROJECT NUMBER

Project No.	Sample Size
75SG42	41
76SG36	54
76SG66	121
77SG12	59
78SG6	75
Total	350

[2/] Norton, J.E. Handbook for Community Manpower Surveys. The W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. Kalamazoo. 1972. P. 54.

Followup and Validation. One telephone contact was made to registrars who did not respond to the mail questionnaire. The analysis of responses indicated that 60% of the sample enrolled at the colleges shown in CAP records. To validate these data, HEDF staff conducted a followup search for additional information on a sample of non-matriculating former clients (N=77). The results of this validation also are presented in the "Findings" section.

Data Analysis. In order to identify differences in client groups which may be related to college matriculation, continuation and/or completion, "t" tests for proportional differences among and between groups were used. Client characteristics data for the total population were analyzed by program division (day/evening), by course of study and by college. Similar tests were used in analyzing sample population data.

III. Research Findings

Using data extracted from NYSDOL files (CETA 100 forms), a client profile for persons admitted to college was prepared. The data indicated that:

1. slightly more than half of all clients (54.5%) and of the clients admitted to post-secondary institutions (52.3%) were female;
2. the majority (64.4%) were between the ages of 22 and 33 years;
3. the majority (62.4%) were black;
4. about one-third (35.1%) were identified as having Spanish surnames;

5. one-fourth (25.0%) of the clients had completed high school before entering the College Adapter Program;
6. nearly all (96.5%) were economically disadvantaged;
7. three-fourths (75.4%) were unemployed prior to entering the program;
8. of those who had worked at some time prior to entering the program, more than three-fifths (60.2%) had worked for an hourly wage of $2.65 or less, the legal minimum wage at the time of the study;
9. clients were admitted to colleges both within and outside the Greater New York area;
10. clients were admitted to a wide range of courses of study;
11. nearly one-third of the CAP clients (N=307) were admitted to programs in liberal arts;
12. nearly one-sixth (N=133), the next largest group, were admitted to courses of study preparing students for accounting or bookkeeping occupations.

Client characteristics data were analyzed by division, by college and by course of study. Major findings were:

Statistically significant differences between day and evening divisions were found in the client characteristics of sex, age, high school graduation, veteran's status and pre-training employment status. On the basis of this analysis, clients studied who had attended the CAP

evening division were more likely to be:

1. male;
2. veterans;
3. over 21 years of age;
4. not high school graduates;
5. employed at the time of entry into the College Adapter Program.

Data on client admissions to college were extracted from material prepared by HEDF staff. Statistically significant differences between the characteristics of clients admitted to different courses of study were found in some cases. The data indicated that:

1. CAP clients admitted to courses of study in preparation for work in health care and secretarial occupations were more likely to be female than were the rest of the total population;
2. clients admitted to engineering related courses were more likely to be male;
3. clients admitted to courses of study related to health care were more likely to be over 21 years of age than was the total population studied;
4. CAP clients entering health care training were more likely to be black than were all other clients;
5. clients entering teacher education were more likely to be "other than black", which includes Spanish surnamed clients;

6. clients admitted to liberal arts and health care courses were less apt to be Spanish surnamed, while clients entering teacher education (including social services) were more apt to meet this test;
7. clients admitted to health care, secretarial, and science related courses were less likely to be veterans than were all other clients;
8. there were no statistically significant differences between groups of clients entering different courses on the basis of pre-training unemployment.

Selected client characteristics data were compared on a college-by-college basis, to determine if any client-related differences existed. Statistically significant differences in the characteristics of clients admitted to different colleges were found in some cases. The findings were:

1. significant differences on the basis of age were found at two colleges, with persons admitted to these institutions more likely to be older than those in the total population;
2. significant differences on the basis of race were found at only one college, with clients admitted to that institution more apt to be non-black;
3. significant differences on the basis of Spanish surname were found at two colleges, with clients more likely to have Spanish surnames;

4. significant differences on the basis of veteran's status were found at two colleges, with clients less likely to be veterans;
5. significant differences on the basis of pre-training employment were found at three colleges, with clients at two colleges more likely to have been unemployed prior to training;
6. no significant differences were found on the basis of sex or pre-training high school graduation.

Thirteen colleges responded to the mail questionnaire, which resulted in a final sample of 284 former clients. The responses showed that approximately 60% (N=172) of the persons surveyed actually matriculated at the college to which they had been admitted as a part of the College Adapter Program. Matriculation data were then analyzed by division, by college and by course of study.

Statistically significant differences were found between clients admitted to programs in the administration and law enforcement categories, with the former group less likely to have matriculated than all other clients. Conversely, clients admitted to courses of study related to law enforcement were more likely to have matriculated than were all others.

No significant differences were found between matriculation rates of groups of clients on the basis of either program division or college to which clients were admitted. For variables where differences were found there was no indication of interrelatedness between client characteristics, division, course of study or college.

Of the 172 clients in the sample who enrolled in college, 130 (75.5%) were still enrolled during the most recent semester at the time of the study (Spring 1978). Of those clients who matriculated, the majority had completed less than two full semesters of study, although a number of former clients were reported as having completed over 60 credit hours (N=5). A few clients were enrolled in remedial courses for which they received no undergraduate credit.

HEDF Data Validation: As stated in the methodology section of this report, the CAP office conducted a mail and telephone followup search for additional information on a group of non-matriculating former clients in the sample. Followup procedures included a post-card mailing to clients, questionnaires to colleges, and interviews with counselors and teachers. Information was obtained on 46 of the clients surveyed (60%), and four of the eight colleges contacted responded to the questionnaire.

Analysis of the data indicated that:

1. approximately 10% of clients sampled who had been admitted to CUNY colleges enrolled in colleges outside the CUNY system (primarily SUNY units);
2. the students matriculating at units of the CUNY system had accumulated an average of 11.5 credit hours by the end of the Spring, 1978 semester;
3. reasons given by former clients for non-matriculation were: money problems (60%); family problems (10%); failure to pass GED (12%); and employment (15%). Of the non-matriculating students who got jobs, 50% had received raises and/or promotions.

As was stated previously, a number of persons reviewed the study report in draft form. Comments received are presented below, and are followed by further clarification of the findings.

Bureau of Special Occupational Education Services Comments:

> My understanding of the original objectives of this study were basically to determine what percentage of the graduates of the CAP program completed college, and to assess the extent of retention in the college program for those persons not completing. It was assumed that these two factors would relate to the degree of employment which could be expected. However, if I am interpreting the report correctly, no statistics are available regarding these factors although they are stated as "purposes of the study." There does not appear to be any reference to the number of completers and the only significant reference to retention states, "of the 172 clients enrolling in college, 130 (75.5%) were still enrolled during the most recent semester at the time of the study (Spring 1978)." Since the report combines statistics from seven CAP programs operating in 1975 through 1978, it would appear that the 130 clients could all have been from the CAP program terminating immediately prior to the Spring of 1978.
>
> At best, assuming that all 130 clients enrolled in the Spring of 1978, would complete and obtain employment, this would calculate to only a 45.7% job placement rate.
>
> $\frac{130}{284}$ - number of students enrolled in Spring of 1978 / number of students in sample $= 45.7\%$
>
> I realize that much can be said for the education received during the college stay although the person may not have completed, and doubtless some people may have obtained employment as a result of this training even though they did not graduate. However, based on the placement goals established by the prime sponsor for skills training programs, (70-75%) and the recent emphasis placed on job placement as a goal for CETA programs, it is doubtful that the CAP program would compare favorably.

Clarification of Findings: As stated in the final report, on the basis of a random sample of clients admitted to a higher education institution, a minimum 60% of CAP clients actually enrolled in college. Although this figure compares unfavorably with the 70-75% placement goal

established by the prime sponsor for this type of program, the 60% cannot be used to evaluate the success of the total CAP effort. For example, referring to project number 75-SG-42, the Special Grant-Program Status Summary dated September 30, 1976 indicates that 23 of 175 clients (13%) became employed rather than entering college. These data are collected by the New York State Manpower Planning Secretariat and were not a part of this study. A complete report on CAP results would include a followup of all other program leavers in addition to those admitted to college.

In regard to college retention rates, the 130 clients enrolled in college during the Spring, 1978 semester were 75.5% of those students in the sample who matriculated, and represent all programs examined (see Table II pg. 5).

Of the 75 clients in the sample drawn from the most recent project, 78SG6, responses were received for 58 persons, 46 (75.9%) of whom matriculated. Thirty-nine of this group of clients (84.8%) are a part of the 130 remaining in college.

Because of the difficulty in obtaining data from CUNY units, the study failed to determine the number of former CAP clients who completed college. However, five persons had completed 60 or more hours of college credit, or the equivalent of two years' full time study. Whether or not these persons received associate degrees was not determined. The majority of former clients had completed less than 30 credit hours, or one year of study, at the time of the survey.

Division of Research Response:

> This memorandum is in response to your request for New York State and national data on matriculation and retention rates for comparison purposes. Let me explain at the outset that "matriculation" is an elusive term in post-secondary education since institutions define it in

various ways. Some consider all enrolled students to be matriculated, whereas others place very specific meanings on their use of the term. Even within one institution, the requirements for "matriculation" may differ between day and evening programs or between continuing education divisions and other divisions. Therefore, meaningful data on "matriculation rates" are rare, especially when more than one institution or type of institution are concerned. The most common and useable data in this regard are usually described by the terms continuation, dropout, persistence, retention, withdrawal, participation, attrition, or survival. The following comments focus on "retention" rates.

My overall impression is that the followup study yields rates for CETA/CAP completers which are quite respectable when placed alongside comparable State and national rates.

For the New York State context, the most recent data on "cohort retention rates" are displayed in Tables III, IV, and V. Tables IV and V are of most relevance since they demonstrate student persistence in two-year programs. The CETA program's 75.5% retention rate is slightly lower than the statewide figures for four-year institutions and programs (Table III), but consistently higher than statewide and sectorwide rates at two-year institutions and programs (Table IV), as well as those at the individual CUNY community colleges (Table V).

For the national context, I believe the best comparative data are those coming out of the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of '72 (National Center for Education Statistics). A 1977 report on the study, entitled Withdrawal from Institutions of Higher Education, provides a wealth of data. From the study's sample of over 20,000 students who were graduated from high school in 1972, the percentages entering college are shown in Table VI. Of the students who entered college, 23.5% withdrew from four-year colleges, and 39.3% withdrew from two-year colleges, over the first two years following high school graduation. Subtracting these figures from 100% shows retention rates of 76.5% and 60.7%, respectively. However, these rates would include students who had transferred from one institution to another. Thus, the CETA/CAP rates exceed comparable national rates.

In addition, the National Longitudinal Study offers data by race and by socioeconomic status. Table VII shows withdrawals from college by race and Table VIII (directly from the report) reports on a sample from the study concerning socioeconomic status, sex, and race, for two-year colleges. The data on "disadvantaged" students (since they are even more comparable than aggregate State and national data as far as the CETA/CAP program is described) better accentuate the relatively high rates of collegiate participation by CETA/CAP program completers.

In summary, the rates observed through the followup study show CETA/CAP program completers participating and persisting in college as well as the total national and State college student populations and better than disadvantaged/minority college student populations.

TABLE III
COHORT RETENTION RATES[1]
NEW YORK STATE
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS AND PROGRAMS

Sector	Percent Enrolled Full-Time			
	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year
State University of New York	83.6%	69.6%	63.6%	8.3%
The City University of New York	76.6	61.7	53.3	34.8
Independent Colleges and Universities	79.3	65.3	58.8	7.2
TOTAL	79.6%	65.4%	58.5%	14.9%

[1]Calculated as percentages of initial cohort group, i.e., full-time, first-time freshmen enrolled in Fall 1972.

SOURCE (Tables III through V): Higher Education Data System (HEDS); Form NYSED-2.9, as reported Fall 1977.

TABLE IV
COHORT RETENTION RATES[1]
NEW YORK STATE
TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS AND PROGRAMS

Sector and Type	Percent Enrolled Full-Time		Percent Granted Degrees	
	2nd Year	3rd Year	After 2 Years	After 3 Years
State University of New York	70.0%	12.4%	39.8%	42.5%
Ag. & Tech. Colleges	71.6	6.0	56.6	57.4
Community Colleges	69.5	14.3	34.6	37.9
The City University of New York	63.9	50.9	4.1	27.5
Community Colleges	63.9	50.9	4.1	27.5
Independent Colleges and Universities	63.7	9.4	38.8	44.8
Two-Year Colleges	63.3	5.2	43.0	47.7
Four-Year Colleges	66.1	32.5	15.4	28.9
Degree-Granting Proprietary Schools	50.9	2.7	15.9	19.0
TOTAL	67.5%	23.7%	28.6%	37.7%

[1]Calculated as percentages of initial cohort group, i.e., full-time, first-time freshmen enrolled in Fall 1974.

TABLE V
COHORT RETENTION RATES[1]
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Institution	Percent Enrolled Full-Time		Percent Granted Degrees	
	2nd Year	3rd Year	After 2 Years	After 3 Years
Bronx[2]	58.0%	48.2%	0.5%	13.3%
Evers[2]	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	21.8
Hostos	64.8	56.3	1.6	33.4
Kingsborough	71.1	51.0	8.6	36.5
LaGuardia	68.2	57.6	3.8	36.5
Manhattan	66.2	52.7	1.2	31.2
New York City	66.1	53.3	5.7	23.2
Queensborough	65.0	53.2	2.5	25.1
Staten Island	66.7	50.4	8.5	36.6
TOTAL	63.9%	50.9%	4.1%	27.5%

[1]Calculated as percentages of initial cohort group, i.e., full-time, first-time freshmen enrolled in Fall 1974.

[2]Some data are not comparable due to the institution's change to a community college during the period.

TABLE VI
HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1972
PERCENTAGE ENTERING COLLEGE

Level of Study	Fall 1972	Fall 1973	Total
Four-Year College	29.40%	2.23%	31.63%
Two-Year College	14.56	2.40	
TOTAL	43.96%	4.63%	48.59%

TABLE VII
HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1972
PERCENTAGE OF THOSE ENROLLED IN COLLEGE
WHO WITHDREW BY FALL 1973

Withdrew From	Black	Hispanic	White
Four-Year College	27.3%	24.8%	23.3%
Two-Year College	47.7	45.3	38.3

SOURCE (Tables VI & VII): National Longitudinal Study, Withdrawal from Institutions of Higher Education, NCES, 1977.

Clarification of Findings: Although the response indicates a favorable retention rate for CAP clients in comparison with other student populations, any such comparison should be treated with caution. It is probable that former CAP clients comprise a part of the college disadvantaged/minority populations cited in both the HEDS and National Longitudinal Studies, is possibly lending distortion to the use of this population as a control group. In addition, CETA screening procedures which provided training to some, but not all, of eligible persons may have produced a select client population. The relationship of CETA screening to matriculation is not known.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions. On the basis of this limited study, it appears that the College Adapter Program was successful in meeting its objective of assisting the majority of clients attain the educational qualifications prerequisite to college admission. For the former clients who actually matriculated, the program appears to have provided a sufficiently solid pre-college foundation to enable most clients to remain in college for a period of time, as is shown by the 75% retention rate.

TABLE VIII
CONTINGENCY DATA BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (SES), SEX, AND RACE
(2-YEAR COLLEGE)

SES	Sex	Race	Percentage				N
			Persister	Transfer	Academic Withdrawal	Nonacademic Withdrawal	
Low	Male	Black	25.64	19.23	5.13	50.00	78
		Hispanic	42.62	6.56	6.56	44.26	61
		White	41.55	16.90	7.04	34.51	142
Low	Female	Black	38.02	13.22	6.61	42.15	121
		Hispanic	50.98	3.92	7.84	37.25	51
		White	37.57	15.03	6.36	41.04	173
Middle	Male	Black	34.62	5.77	9.62	50.00	52
		Hispanic	35.14	10.81	24.32	29.73	37
		White	36.77	21.12	6.83	35.28	805
Middle	Female	Black	40.74	22.22	8.64	28.40	81
		Hispanic	57.50	2.50	2.50	37.50	40
		White	42.38	21.19	4.93	31.49	689
High	Male	Black	41.67	33.33	0.00	25.00	12
		Hispanic	63.64	18.18	9.09	9.09	11
		White	38.41	29.58	5.30	26.71	453
High	Female	Black	46.15	15.38	0.00	38.46	13
		Hispanic	28.57	28.57	0.00	42.86	7
		White	34.22	29.68	2.67	33.42	374

Although the fact of enrollment in the College Adapter Program may appear to indicate interest in attending and remaining in college on the part of clients, no conclusions as to client motivation are warranted on the basis of the study. This limitation applies, also, to the apparent sex-stereotyping revealed in the client profile where significant differences were found in the percent of clients enrolling in traditionally male or female occupations.

Some significant differences between groups of former clients were found but these differences appear to have no relationship either to matriculation or to continuation in college. Therefore, no conclusions can be drawn as to the appropriateness of client selection processes, CAP program content, college admissions practices, or other factors in working with this particular CETA client population.

Recommendations. The problem of adequate post-training followup of CETA completers is acute. If program recycle decisions are to be made on the basis of the post-training experience of former CETA clients, it is recommended that provision for followup be made a part of each CETA project.

Further study could include an analysis of the post-training experience of non-matriculating clients or a comparison of the post-training experience of CETA clients with that of non-CETA persons drawn from the same population.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A. CAP CETA Project Descriptions 22

APPENDIX B. Data Sources Utilized in CAP Followup Study 24

APPENDIX C. CAP Course Combinations Used in Data Tabulation and Analysis 26

APPENDIX D. Table 1 College Admissions and Characteristics of CETA Clients, College Adapter Program 27

Table II CAP Client Characteristics, by Course of Study 28

APPENDIX E. List of CUNY Units Admitting CAP Clients 29

APPENDIX F. Sample Questionnaire 30

APPENDIX A
CAP CETA PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

The College Adapter Program has three divisions: a Day-CAP division, an Evening-CAP division and a Prison Project division which operates programs at Riker's Island and the Bronx House of Detention. For the purpose of this study, the CETA projects to be examined are limited to the Evening and Day programs.

Project 77-SG-12 (Evening Program):

> A program to provide academic training and counseling for 225 persons in GED/College Entry at a total cost of $178,125, including screening, assessment and placement services. The program operated from December 1, 1976 to September 30, 1977. The purpose of the program was to place referrals in an appropriate job and/or enrollment in a college program upon completion of the project. This project, as amended, included two experimental Saturday programs: a College Bound program for students who held a high school diploma or GED and needed some skills upgrading before entering college, and a "pre-CAP" program for students whose basic literacy was at a minimum level and needed upgrading to enter the regular CAP program. No stipends are paid in the program.

Project 78-SG-11 (Evening Program):

> A program to provide academic training, and counseling and placement for 200 persons in GED/College Entry at a total cost of $202,278. The program is to operate from October 1, 1977 to September 30, 1978, with an average of 330 hours of instruction and services to be provided for each trainee. A subsistence allowance of $10 per week is allowed for each trainee.

Project 76-SG-66 (Day Program):

> A program to provide academic training, counseling and placement for 520 persons in GED/College Entry at a total cost of $638,075. An additional $63,464 was paid as stipends by the city. The program operated from July 1, 1976 to June 30, 1977.

Project 77-SG-48 (Day Program):

A program to provide academic training, counseling and placement for 250 persons in GED/College entry at a total cost of $168,000. The program operated from July 1, 1977 to September 30, 1977. The project span was approximately 13 weeks, with an average of 132 hours of instruction and services and spans approximately 26 weeks. However, Fiscal Year 1977 monies were allocated only for the 13 week period ending September 30, 1977. Training beyond September 30, 1977 was undertaken with Fiscal Year 1978 funds.

Project 78-SG-6:

A program to provide academic training, counseling and placement for approximately 520 persons in GED/College entry at a total cost of $713,714. The program will operate from October 1, 1977 to September 30, 1978. The total number of persons to receive some training is actually 780, however, 260 were carried in from the previous FY '77 project, 260 will enroll and terminate and 260 will enroll and receive some training but must complete in a FY '79 funded project. The complete span of training consists of 330 hours of instruction and services. Participants receive a subsistence allowance of $10 per week paid out of project funds.

APPENDIX B
DATA SOURCES UTILIZED IN CAP FOLLOWUP STUDY

Sources explored as being potentially useful include: Higher Education Development Fund records; New York State Manpower Planning Secretariat data files; SED Bureau of Special Occupational Education Services files; SED Higher Education Opportunity Program Office (HEOP).

The Bureau of Special Occupational Education Services provided the descriptions of the projects being examined.

HEDF provided the names, social security numbers and college admission data for all CETA project completers who were admitted to college from the inception of the project through January 1978, for a total of 1,023 former clients.

The Manpower Planning Secretariat provided computer printouts for the projects studied giving CETA 100 and CETA 200 client data. The printouts covered project activity through January 1978. The Secretariat also provided access to CETA 100 and CETA 200 data which did not appear on the printouts.

Matriculation data for clients who enrolled at CUNY units was extracted from CUNY Registrars' Offices through use of a mail questionnaire (Appendix F).

If needed, a client followup phase will be initiated, with the HEDF offices to be the primary client contact agency. The HEDF offices will be a partner with the BOER in the design of the followup phase, which will include a segment on the post-training labor market experience of project completers.

College matriculation, completion and continuation rates will be compared for groups of clients possessing various characteristics. Variables to be examined include age, previous education previous work experience, ethnic group, pretraining income, and course of study. It is expected that data will be obtained on approximately 80% of CETA project completers.

APPENDIX C
CAP COURSE COMBINATIONS
USED IN DATA TABULATION AND ANALYSIS

Liberal Arts

Health Care
- Nursing
- Child Care
- Therapy
- Health

Secretarial

Accounting
- Data Processing
- Computer Sciences

Administration
- Business Administration
- Government
- Public Administration
- Economics

Teacher Education
- Social Work

Science
- Medical Laboratory Technician
- Dental Laboratory Technician
- Opthalmalic

Law Enforcement
- Police Science
- Criminal Justice

Engineering
- Electrical/Electrician Technician
- Mechanical Technology

Commercial Art

Other not elsewhere classified
- Real Estate
- Recreation
- Performing Arts
- Marketing

APPENDIX D

TABLE I
COLLEGE ADMISSIONS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CETA CLIENTS,
COLLEGE ADAPTER PROGRAM

	Day		Evening		Total (%)	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)		
Total Clients	571	(56)	449	(44)	1020	(100.0)
Term of College Admission:						
Spring 1976			96	(21)	96	(9.4)
Fall 1976			131	(29)	131	(12.8)
Spring 1977	158	(20)	46	(10)	204	(20.0)
Fall 1977	211	(37)	170	(38)	381	(37.4)
Spring 1978	202	(35)	6	(1)	208	(20.4)
Sex						
Male	234	(41)	253	(56)	487	(47.8)
Female	337	(59)	196	(44)	533	(52.3)
Age						
Under 21	140	(24)	59	(13)	199	(19.5)
22-33	341	(60)	315	(70)	656	(64.3)
34-44	64	(11)	59	(13)	123	(12.1)
45 and over	26	(5)	16	(4)	42	(4.1)
Race						
Black	372	(65)	264	(59)	636	(62.4)
Other	199	(35)	185	(41)	384	(37.6)
Spanish Surnamed	178	(31)	180	(40)	358	(35.1)
High School Diploma Prior to Entry	196	(34)	59	(13)	255	(25.0)
Economically Disadvantaged	544	(95)	440	(98)	984	(96.5)
Veteran	38	(7)	76	(17)	114	(11.2)
Handicapped	13	(2)	1	(1)	14	(1.4)
Pre-Training Labor Force Status						
Employed	14	(2)	75	(17)	89	(8.7)
Underemployed	54	(10)	199	(22)	154	(15.1)
Unemployed	503	(88)	271	(60)	774	(75.9)
Pre-Training Hourly Wage	N=435		N=345			
$2.65 or under	266	(61)	205	(59)	471	(60.2)
2.66 to 3.25	77	(18)	68	(27)	145	(18.5)
3.26 or over	94	(21)	72	(21)	166	(21.2)

APPENDIX D

TABLE II

CAP CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS, BY COURSE OF STUDY

Course of Study	Total	Sex		Age				Race		Span. Sur.	High School	Econ. Dis.	Vet	Handi-capped	Labor Force Status			Pre-Training Wage		
		M=1	F=2	Under 21	22-33	34-44	45+	Black	Other						Emp.	Under Emp.	Un-Emp.	2.65 or less	2.66 -3.25	3.2 +
Liberal Arts	307	139	168	59	204	33	11	194	113	106	77	299	36	5	27	46	233	145	41	50
Health Care	90	12	78	5	60	18	7	71	19	17	28	85	4	-	2	12	75	35	16	20
Secretarial	34	1	33	9	21	3	1	17	17	16	10	34	-	-	2	8	24	15	6	4
Accounting	133	70	63	35	78	14	6	72	61	53	36	127	14	3	9	20	104	61	21	19
Administration	84	41	43	14	57	11	2	62	22	21	19	82	9	1	14	13	57	39	11	23
Teacher Educ.	69	31	38	12	38	13	6	30	39	38	22	65	4	1	3	12	54	32	7	11
Science	55	23	32	14	37	3	1	29	26	25	16	52	8	2	7	3	45	23	12	8
Law Enforcement	26	9	17	11	14	-	1	19	7	6	3	26	1	-	1	4	21	10	4	2
Engineering	96	90	6	18	64	11	3	49	47	45	22	92	15	1	5	20	70	39	18	17
Commercial Art	24	15	9	7	15	1	1	17	7	6	2	24	3	-	1	5	18	13	4	1
Other	102	56	46	15	68	16	3	76	26	25	20	98	20	-	18	11	73	59	5	9
Total	1020	487	533	199	656	123	42	636	384	358	255	984	114	14	89	154	774	471	145	166

APPENDIX E
LIST OF CUNY UNITS
ADMITTING CAP CLIENTS

Bernard M. Baruch College
Brooklyn College
City College of New York
College of Staten Island
Herbert H. Lehman College
Hunter College
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Queens College
York College
Manhattan Community College
Bronx Community College
Hostos Community College
La Guardia Community College
Kingsborough Community College
Medgar Evers Community College
New York City Community College
Queensborough Community College

APPENDIX F

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12234

DIVISION OF RESEARCH
BUREAU OF OCCUPATIONAL
EDUCATION RESEARCH
518: 474-6386

Dear

At the request of the Bureau of Special Occupational Education Services, The State Education Department, the Bureau of Occupational Education Research is conducting an evaluative follow-up study of persons who received college preparatory training under the Federal Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). The training was provided by the Higher Education Development Fund (HEDF) College Adapter Program during the period July 1, 1976 through January 31, 1978.

HEDF records indicate that each of the former CETA clients in the survey was accepted for admission to a unit of the City University of New York. However, little or no information is available on actual matriculation of the students in the program or on their continuation in college. Please provide this information for the sample of former CETA clients admitted to your institution identified on the attached College Matriculation Data Sheet.

Each student drawn in the sample has been identified by name, social security number, semester of admission and major area of study. The form is designed to elicit data on 1) student matriculation; 2) continuation in college; and 3) credit hour completion. Confidentiality of data will be maintained, and no individual student will be identified in the study report.

Please complete the data items for each student in the sample according to the directions on the data sheet. At the top of the sheet, enter the name and telephone number of the person completing the form, and return to this office by June 30, 1978. A return envelope is enclosed.

Thank you for your assistance with this study. Questions pertaining to the survey should be directed to:

Mrs. Dorothy H. King
New York State Education Department
Bureau of Occupational Education Research
Room 468EBA
Albany, NY 12234
Phone: 518:474-6386

Sincerely, Alan Robertson

Alan G. Robertson, Chief
Bureau of Occupational Education Research

37

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Division of Research
Bureau of Occupational Education Research

CETA College Adapter Program Follow-up Study

College Matriculation Data Sheet

College Name _____

Address _____

Information Provided by _____

Telephone No. _____

Student Identification & Admission (1.0)		Matriculation (2.0)		Continuation (3.0)				Completion (4.0)
Name (1.1)	SS# (1.2)	Did Student Enroll? (Please check one) If "no", go to next name.		Did Student Complete Spring 1978 Semester? (Please check one)		If "no" please give Withdrawal Date		Please Enter Credit Hours Completed To June 15, 1978
Semester Admitted (1.3)	Curriculum (1.4)	Yes (2.1)	No (2.2)	Yes (3.1)	No (3.2)	Month (3.3)	Year (3.4)	(4.1) - 4.6)
		—	—	—	—	____	____	—
		—	—	—	—	____	____	—
		—	—	—	—	____	____	—
		—	—	—	—	____	____	—
		—	—	—	—	____	____	—
		—	—	—	—	____	____	—